

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 24 have been amended. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, amendments made to the claims as indicated herein have been made to exclusively improve readability and clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of overcoming alleged prior art.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Berger et al., U.S. PG Publication No. US 2003/0014466 A1 (hereinafter “Berger”) in view of Armstrong et al., U.S. PG Publication No. US 2002/0156824 A1 (hereinafter “Armstrong”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention and appears as follows:

1. A machine-implemented method, comprising:
 - establishing, within a global operating system environment provided by an operating system, a non-global partition, among a plurality of non-global partitions within the global operating system environment, which serves to isolate processes running within the non-global partition from other non-global partitions within the global operating system environment, wherein the non-global operating system partitions do not each have a separate operating system kernel executing therein;
 - associating a first resource limit with the non-global partition, wherein the first resource limit indicates a maximum amount of a particular resource that can be allocated to the non-global partition;
 - associating a second resource limit with a first group of two or more processes within the non-global partition, wherein the second resource limit indicates a maximum amount of the particular resource that can be allocated to the first group of two or more processes; and
 - associating a third resource limit with a second group of two or more processes within the non-global partition, wherein the third resource limit indicates a

maximum amount of the particular resource that can be allocated to the second group of two or more processes.

In particular, neither Berger nor Armstrong alone or in combination teach or disclose associating a second resource limit with a first group of two or more processes within the non-global partition, wherein the second resource limit indicates a maximum amount of the particular resource that can be allocated to the first group of two or more processes, and associating a third resource limit with a second group of two or more processes within the non-global partition, wherein the third resource limit indicates a maximum amount of the particular resource that can be allocated to the second group of two or more processes as cited in Claim 1. The Office Action states:

“However, both Berger and Armstrong teach that separate applications are allocated teach of the partitions (Berger [0035], wherein applications are separated in compartments; Armstrong [0026], wherein logical partitions allows the isolation of tasks). It is old and well known to place resource limits on tasks that share the same resources to provide for the efficient sharing of resources. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to including associating a resource limit with a group of one or more processes within the partitions.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees, nevertheless, neither Berger nor Armstrong teach or disclose having a first group of two or more processes and a second group of two or more processes within a non-global partition. Further, neither Berger nor Armstrong teach or disclose associating a second resource limit with the first group of two or more processes and associating a third resource limit with the second group of two or more processes. Therefore, neither Berger nor Armstrong alone or in combination contemplate associating a second resource limit with a first group of two or more processes within the non-global partition, wherein the second resource limit indicates a maximum amount of the particular resource that can be allocated to the first group of two or more processes, and associating a third resource limit with a second group of two or more processes within the non-global partition, wherein the third resource limit indicates a

maximum amount of the particular resource that can be allocated to the second group of two or more processes as cited in Claim 1.

Therefore, neither Berger nor Armstrong alone or in combination teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claims 1, 9, and 17 are allowable. Claims 2-8, and 10-16, and 18-24, are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including any art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all of the pending claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1214 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: January 21, 2009

/KirkDWong#43284/

Attorney Kirk D. Wong
Reg. No. 43,284

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1214
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076